

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 11, and 23 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-29 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628 to Anuff et al. (hereinafter “Anuff”). Claims 5, 15, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,673 to Maslov (hereinafter “Maslov”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Anuff.

Applicants respectfully note that to anticipate a pending claim, a prior art reference must provide, either expressly or inherently, each and every limitation of the pending claim. (M.P.E.P. § 2131).

The Office Action alleges that Anuff teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations of claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29. However, based on the arguments presented below, Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-19, 21-25, and 27-29.

Claim 11

Claim 11 recites a method for generating a graphical user interface (GUI), the method comprising:

providing a data source interface that enables a user to declaratively specify access information for a data source during one or more interactive sessions with the data source interface;

determining a declarative specification for the data source based on access information provided by the user during an interactive session with the data source interface;

retrieving data for the data source using the access information;

providing a layout interface that enables the user to declaratively specify a layout for the data for the data source during one or more interactive sessions with the layout interface;

determining a layout specification based on the layout provided by the user during an interactive session with the layout interface, the layout specification indicative of one or more visualizations of the data for the data source on the graphical user interface; and

generating coding representing an object that creates a graphical user interface displaying the retrieved data according to the layout provided by the user based on the declarative specification for the data source and the layout specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in claim 11. As recited above, coding representing an object that creates a graphical user interface displaying retrieved data according to a layout provided by a user is generated based on a declarative specification for a data source and a layout specification. As recited above, the declarative specification for the data source and the layout specification are determined from a user during an interactive sessions with a data source interface and a layout interface.

Anuff, however, fails to teach or suggest that the modules in Anuff that generate HTML pages are created as recited in claim 11 from a declarative specification for the data source and the layout specification determined from a user during an interactive sessions with a data source interface and a layout interface. Anuff simply discloses that users are allowed to rearrange modules on a page, or to further refine what predetermined information should be displayed by a module. However, only the administrator in Anuff can create the modules, and Anuff fails to teach or suggest that the administrator creates the modules using a declarative

specification for a data source and a layout specification determined during an interactive sessions with a data source interface and a layout interface as recited in claim 11.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Anuff fails to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation recited in claim 11. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-29

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 23 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 11, and others.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-10, 12-22, and 24-29 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 11, and 23 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims.

Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 5, 15, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff. Applicants further respectfully traverse the rejections to claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, in view of Maslov.

Appl. No. 10/676,829
Amdt. dated October 29, 2007
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2007

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lts
61144263 v1